arXiv:1101.1933v1 [math.RT] 10 Jan 2011

LAYER LENGTHS, TORSION THEORIES AND THE FINITISTIC DIMENSION

FRANÇOIS HUARD,
MARCELO LANZILOTTA,
OCTAVIO MENDOZA

Abstract. Let Λ be a left-artinian ring. Generalizing the Loewy length, we propose the layer length associated with a torsion theory, which is a new measure for finitely generated Λ-modules. As an application, we obtain a theorem having as corollaries the main results of [3] and [7].

1. Layer lengths

Throughout the paper, we fix the following notation. Λ will be a left-artinian ring and $\mathcal{C} := \mathrm{mod}\,(\Lambda)$ the category of finitely generated left Λ-modules. We also denote by $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}\,(\mathcal{C})$ the category of all additive functors from $\mathcal{C}$ to $\mathcal{C}$. Furthermore we let rad (resp. soc) denote the Jacobson's radical (resp. socle) lying in $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}\,(\mathcal{C})$. Note that the functors rad and soc are both subfunctors of the identity $1_{\mathcal{C}}$. Recall that if α and β belong to $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}\,(\mathcal{C})$ and α is a subfunctor of β, we have the quotient functor $\beta/\alpha \in \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}\,(\mathcal{C})$ which is defined as follows:

(a) $(\beta/\alpha)(M) := \beta(M)/\alpha(M)$ for $M \in \mathcal{C}$, and

(b) $(\beta/\alpha)(f)\,(x + \alpha\,(M)) := \beta\,(f)\,(x) + \alpha\,(N)$ for a morphism $f : M \to N$ in $\mathcal{C}$.

Furthermore, we set $\mathrm{top} := 1_{\mathcal{C}}/\mathrm{rad} \in \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}\,(\mathcal{C})$. Finally, we also recall that the functors rad and $1_{\mathcal{C}}/\mathrm{soc}$ preserve monomorphisms and epimorphisms in $\mathcal{C}$.

Given $\alpha \in \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}\,(\mathcal{C})$, we consider the **$\alpha$-radical functor** $\mathrm{F}_\alpha := \mathrm{rad} \circ \alpha$ and the **α-socle quotient functor** $\mathrm{G}_\alpha := \alpha/(\mathrm{soc} \circ \alpha)$ where $\circ$ is the composition in $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}\,(\mathcal{C})$. Furthermore, we consider the classes $\mathcal{F}_\alpha = \{\ M \in \mathcal{C}\ :\ \alpha(M) = 0\ \}$ and $\mathcal{T}_\alpha = \{\ M \in \mathcal{C}\ :\ \alpha(M) = M\ \}$. Also we set $\min \emptyset := \infty$.

Definition 1.1. *For α and β in $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}\,(\mathcal{C})$, we define:*

(a) *the* **(α, β)-layer length** $\ell\ell_\alpha^\beta : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$

$$\ell\ell_\alpha^\beta(M) := \min\{i \geq 0\ :\ \alpha \circ \beta^i(M) = 0\ \};$$

(b) *the* **α-radical layer length** $\ell\ell^\alpha := \ell\ell_\alpha^{\mathrm{F}_\alpha}$ *and the* **α-socle layer length** $\ell\ell_\alpha := \ell\ell_\alpha^{\mathrm{G}_\alpha}$.

Note that $\ell\ell^\alpha(M)$ and $\ell\ell_\alpha(M)$ are finite for all M in $\mathcal{C}$.

Example 1.2. *The Loewy length is obtained by taking $\alpha = 1_{\mathcal{C}}$ in 1.1 (b). This yields the usual radical layer length $\ell\ell^{1_{\mathcal{C}}}$ and socle layer length $\ell\ell_{1_{\mathcal{C}}}$. In this case, it is well known that $\ell\ell^{1_{\mathcal{C}}} = \ell\ell_{1_{\mathcal{C}}}$.*

The authors thank the financial supports received from Proyecto PAPIIT-Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México IN100810-3 MEXICO, Proyecto FCE-ANII 059 URUGUAY and NSERC Discovery Grants Program CANADA.

We have the following natural question: Under what conditions can we compare $\ell\ell^{\alpha}$ with $\ell\ell_{\beta}$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in \operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathcal{C})$? In order to answer this question, we propose "Comparison Theorems". We first need to develop some necessary theory about layer lengths.

Lemma 1.3. *Let α and β be in $\operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathcal{C})$. Then*

(a) $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha} = \{\ M \in \mathcal{C}\ :\ \ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(M) = 0\}$;

(b) $\ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(M) = \ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(\beta(M)) + 1$ *for any* $M \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{F}_{\alpha}$*;*

(c) *if $M \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha}$ and $M \neq 0$, then $\ell\ell^{\alpha}(M) = \ell\ell^{\alpha}(\operatorname{rad}(M)) + 1$ and $\ell\ell_{\alpha}(M) = \ell\ell_{\alpha}(M/\operatorname{soc}(M)) + 1$.*

Proof. (a) It is easy to see that: $M \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha} \Leftrightarrow \alpha(M) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(M) = 0$.

(b) Take $M \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\alpha(M) \neq 0$. In particular $\ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(M) \geq 1$. Now for $i \geq 1$, $\beta^{i}(M) = \beta^{i-1}(\beta(M))$ and then $\ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(M) = \ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(\beta(M)) + 1$.

(c) Take $0 \neq M \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha}$. It is clear that $M \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{F}_{\alpha}$ because $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha} \cap \mathcal{T}_{\alpha} = \{0\}$. Since $\alpha(M) = M$, it follows that $\mathrm{F}_{\alpha}(M) = \operatorname{rad}(M)$ and $\mathrm{G}_{\alpha}(M) = M/\operatorname{soc}(M)$. Hence, by (b), we get the result. □

Lemma 1.4. *Let α and β be in $\operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathcal{C})$. Then*

(a) $\ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(M \oplus N) = \max\{\ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(M), \ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(N)\}$ *for any* $M, N \in \mathcal{C}$;

(b) *if α and β preserve epimorphisms, then*

  (b1) $\ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(M) \leq \ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(L)$ *for any epimorphism* $L \to M$ *in* $\mathcal{C}$,

  (b2) $\ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(M) \leq \ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}({}_{\Lambda}\Lambda)$ *for each* $M \in \mathcal{C}$;

(c) *If α and β preserve monomorphisms, then $\ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(L) \leq \ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(M)$ for any monomorphism $L \to M$ in $\mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. (a) Consider $a := \ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(M \oplus N)$. If $a = \infty$, then $\alpha \circ \beta^{i}(M \oplus N) \neq 0$ for all $i \geq 0$. Let $b := \max\{\ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(M), \ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(N)\}$. If $b < \infty$ then $\alpha \circ \beta^{b}(M) = \alpha \circ \beta^{b}(N) = 0$ hence $\alpha \circ \beta^{b}(M \oplus N) = 0$ a contradiction. If $a < \infty$, then $0 = \alpha \circ \beta^{a}(M \oplus N)$ and since $\alpha \circ \beta^{a}$ is an additive functor, it follows that $n := \max\{\ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(M), \ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(N)\} \leq a$. On the other hand $0 = \alpha \circ \beta^{n}(M) \oplus \alpha \circ \beta^{n}(N) = \alpha \circ \beta^{n}(M \oplus N)$ implies that $a \leq n$.

(b) Suppose that α and β preserve epimorphisms. Let $n := \ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(L)$ where $f : L \to M$ is an epimorphism in $\mathcal{C}$. If $n = \infty$, then (b1) is immediate, otherwise, since $\alpha \circ \beta^{n}(f)$ is an epimorphism and $\alpha \circ \beta^{n}(L) = 0$, we get that $\ell\ell_{\alpha}^{\beta}(M) \leq n$; proving (b1). Finally, (b2) follows from (b1) and (a) since M is finitely generated.

The proof of (c) is similar to that of (b1). □

We recall the following definitions that can be found, for example, in [1, 4].

Definition 1.5. *For $\alpha \in \operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathcal{C})$, we say that α is a* **pre-radical** *if α is a subfunctor of $1_{\mathcal{C}}$. In case α is a pre-radical, we set $q_{\alpha} := 1_{\mathcal{C}}/\alpha \in \operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathcal{C})$. Furthermore, if α is a pre-radical satisfying $\alpha \circ q_{\alpha} = 0$ then α is a* **radical***.*

The following two lemmas will be useful for the Comparison Theorems.

Lemma 1.6. *Let $\alpha \in \operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathcal{C})$ be a pre-radical. Then*

(a) *α preserves monomorphisms;*

(b) *$\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ is closed under submodules and finite coproducts;*

(c) *$\mathcal{T}_\alpha$ is closed under quotients and finite coproducts;*

(d) *if α preserves epimorphisms then α is a radical.*

Proof. Let $f : M \to N$ be a monomorphism. Consider the inclusions $i_M : \alpha(M) \to M$ and $i_N : \alpha(N) \to N$. Thus $i_N\,\alpha(f) = f\,i_M$, and since f is a monomorphism, then so is $\alpha(f)$, proving (a). For (b) and (c) see [4, Ch. VI, Prop. 1.2]. For (d) see [4, Ch. VI, Ex. 5]. □

Lemma 1.7. *Let $\alpha \in \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathcal{C})$ be a pre-radical. The following conditions are equivalent.*

(a) *The functor α is left exact.*

(b) *The class $\mathcal{T}_\alpha$ is closed under submodules and $\alpha^2 = \alpha$.*

(c) *The functor q_α preserves monomorphisms.*

Proof. (a)⇔(b) See in [4, Ch. VI, Prop. 1.7].

(a)⇔(c) Consider an exact sequence $0 \to M \overset{f}{\to} N \overset{g}{\to} X \to 0$ in $\mathcal{C}$. We have the following exact and commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & & \\
0 \arrow[r] & \alpha(M) \arrow[r, "i_M"] \arrow[d, "\alpha(f)"'] & M \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "f"'] & q_\alpha(M) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "q_\alpha(f)"'] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \alpha(N) \arrow[r, "i_N"] \arrow[d, "\pi"'] & N \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "g"'] & q_\alpha(N) \arrow[r] & 0 \\
 & \overline{X} \arrow[r, "\mu"] \arrow[d] & X \arrow[d] & & \\
 & 0 & 0 & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\overline{X} := \alpha(N)/\mathrm{Im}(\alpha(f))$ and $\pi(x) := x + \mathrm{Im}(\alpha(f))$. By the Snake's Lemma, we have that $\mathrm{Ker}(q_\alpha(f)) \simeq \mathrm{Ker}(\mu)$, and hence the item (c) is equivalent to saying that μ is a monomorphism.

Since $gf = 0$, it follows that $\alpha(g)\,\alpha(f) = 0$ and hence there exists a morphism $\beta : \overline{X} \to \alpha(X)$ such that $\beta\,\pi = \alpha(g)$; therefore $\mathrm{Ker}(\beta) = \mathrm{Ker}(\alpha(g))/\mathrm{Im}(\alpha(f))$. Furthermore, we assert that the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \alpha(X) \arrow[dr, "i_X"] & \\
\overline{X} \arrow[ur, "\beta"] \arrow[rr, "\mu"] & & X.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Indeed $\mu\,\pi = g\,i_N = i_X\,\alpha(g) = i_X\,\beta\,\pi$ and since π is an epimorphism, it follows that $\mu = i_X\,\beta$. Therefore, the proof follows from the following equivalences : α is left exact $\Leftrightarrow$ $\mathrm{Ker}\,(\alpha\,(g)) = \mathrm{Im}\,(\alpha\,(f))$ $\Leftrightarrow$ β is a monomorphism $\Leftrightarrow$ μ is a monomorphism $\Leftrightarrow$ $\mathrm{Ker}\,(q_\alpha\,(f)) = 0$. $\square$

2. Two comparison theorems for layer lengths

In this section, we state and prove two comparison theorems for layer lengths. To do that, we need some propositions and lemmas as follows.

Proposition 2.1. *Let* $\alpha \in \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}\,(\mathcal{C})$ *be a pre-radical which preserves epimorphisms. If* $0 \neq M \in \mathcal{C}$ *and* $\mathrm{soc}\,(M) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$*, then* $M \notin \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ *and* $\ell\ell^\alpha\,(M/\mathrm{soc}\,(M)) + 1 = \ell\ell^\alpha\,(M)$.

Proof. Let $0 \neq M \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\mathrm{soc}\,(M) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$. Note that $M \notin \mathcal{F}_\alpha$, otherwise, by 1.6 (b), $\mathrm{soc}\,(M) \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ and so $\mathrm{soc}\,(M) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{F}_\alpha = \{0\}$; contradicting that $M \neq 0$. Since $M \notin \mathcal{F}_\alpha$, we have $m := \ell\ell^\alpha(M) > 0$ (see 1.3 (a)). Take $N := \alpha \circ \mathrm{F}_\alpha^{m-1}(M)$ which is a submodule of M since α and rad preserve monomorphisms.
We assert that N is semisimple. Indeed, $\alpha\,(\mathrm{rad}\,(N)) = \alpha \circ \mathrm{F}_\alpha^{m}(M) = 0$ and hence $\mathrm{rad}\,(N) \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$. Then, by 1.6 (b), it follows that $\mathrm{soc}\,(\mathrm{rad}\,(N)) \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$. On the other hand, there is an epimorphism $\mathrm{soc}\,(M) = \mathrm{soc}\,(N) \oplus X \to \mathrm{soc}\,(\mathrm{rad}\,(N))$ for some $X \in \mathcal{C}$. Thus, by 1.6 (c), we get $\mathrm{soc}\,(\mathrm{rad}\,(N)) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$ since $\mathrm{soc}\,(M) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$. Hence $\mathrm{soc}\,(\mathrm{rad}\,(N)) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{F}_\alpha = \{0\}$ showing that $\mathrm{rad}\,(N) = 0$; therefore N is semisimple. Furthermore, since the pre-radicals α and rad preserve epimorphisms, then so does the preradical $\alpha \circ \mathrm{F}_\alpha^{m-1}$. Therefore, we get the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M \arrow[r, "p_1"] & M/\mathrm{soc}\,(M) \\
\alpha \circ \mathrm{F}_\alpha^{m-1}\,(M) = N \arrow[u, "i_1"] \arrow[r, "p_2"'] & \alpha \circ \mathrm{F}_\alpha^{m-1}\,(M/\mathrm{soc}\,(M)) \arrow[u, "i_2"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

where p_1 is the canonical epimorphism, $p_2 = \alpha \circ \mathrm{F}_\alpha^{m-1}\,(p_1)$ and i_1 and i_2 are the inclusions. Now, N semisimple implies that $i_1(N) \subseteq \mathrm{soc}\,(M)$ and hence $i_2\,p_2 = p_1\,i_1 = 0$, proving that $p_2 = 0$ since i_2 is a monomorphism. Then we get that $\alpha \circ \mathrm{F}_\alpha^{m-1}(M/\mathrm{soc}\,(M)) = 0$ and hence $n := \ell\ell^\alpha\,(M/\mathrm{soc}\,(M)) \leq m-1$. Suppose that $n < m-1$. Consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M \arrow[r, "p_1"] & M/\mathrm{soc}\,(M) \\
\alpha \circ \mathrm{F}_\alpha^{n}\,(M) \arrow[u, "j_1"] \arrow[r, "p_3"'] & 0 \arrow[u, "j_2"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $p_3 = \alpha \circ \mathrm{F}_\alpha^{n}\,(p_1)$ and j_1 and j_2 are the inclusion maps. Thus $p_1\,j_1 = 0$ and then $\alpha \circ \mathrm{F}_\alpha^{n}\,(M) \subseteq \mathrm{soc}\,(M)$. So $\alpha \circ \mathrm{F}_\alpha^{n+1}\,(M) = \alpha\,(\mathrm{rad}\,(\alpha \circ \mathrm{F}_\alpha^{n}(M))) = 0$ and hence $\ell\ell^\alpha\,(M) \leq n+1 < m$, a contradiction, proving that $n = m-1$. $\square$

Lemma 2.2. *Let* $\alpha, \beta \in \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}\,(\mathcal{C})$ *be such that* β *is a radical and* α *is a pre-radical. If* $\mathcal{F}_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\beta$ *then* $\mathrm{soc}\,(\mathrm{Im}\,(q_\beta)) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{F}_\beta$.

Proof. Since $\beta \circ q_\beta = 0$ it follows that $\mathrm{Im}\,(q_\beta) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\beta$, therefore, $\mathrm{soc}\,(\mathrm{Im}\,(q_\beta)) \subset \mathcal{F}_\beta$. It remains to prove that $\mathrm{soc}\,(\mathrm{Im}\,(q_\beta)) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\alpha$. Let $M \in \mathrm{Im}\,(q_\beta)$ and take any simple S in $\mathrm{soc}\,(M)$. We assert that $\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(-,S)|_{\mathcal{T}_\beta} = 0$; otherwise, there is an $X \in \mathcal{T}_\beta$ and an epimorphism $X \to S$ and so $S \in \mathcal{T}_\beta$. Hence $S \in \mathcal{T}_\beta \cap \mathcal{F}_\beta$ since $\mathrm{soc}\,(M) \in \mathcal{F}_\beta$.

Then $S = 0$, a contradiction, proving that $\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(-, S)|_{\mathcal{T}_\beta} = 0$. In particular, using that $\mathcal{F}_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\beta$, we get $\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(-, S)|_{\mathcal{F}_\alpha} = 0$ and then $S \notin \mathcal{F}_\alpha$. Consider now the following exact sequence

$$0 \to \alpha(S) \to S \to q_\alpha(S) \to 0.$$

We have that $\alpha(S) \neq 0$ (otherwise, $S \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$). Hence $\alpha(S) = S$ giving us that $S \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$ for all simple in $\mathrm{soc}(M)$. Then $\mathrm{soc}(M) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$. □

The following result will be our first comparison theorem.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathcal{C})$ be radicals such that α preserves epimorphisms. Then $\ell\ell_{q_\beta}(M) \leq \ell\ell^\alpha(M)$ for each $M \in \mathcal{C}$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\beta$.*

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) Let $\ell\ell_{q_\beta}(M) \leq \ell\ell^\alpha(M)$ for each $M \in \mathcal{C}$. If $M \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ then $\ell\ell^\alpha(M) = 0$ and so $\ell\ell_{q_\beta}(M) = 0$; proving that $M \in \mathcal{F}_{q_\beta} = \mathcal{T}_\beta$. Hence $\mathcal{F}_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\beta$.

($\Leftarrow$) Let $\mathcal{F}_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\beta$. To prove that $\ell\ell_{q_\beta}(M) \leq \ell\ell^\alpha(M)$ for each $M \in \mathcal{C}$, we use induction on $\ell\ell^\alpha(M)$. If $\ell\ell^\alpha(M) = 0$ then $M \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\beta = \mathcal{F}_{q_\beta}$. Therefore $\ell\ell_{q_\beta}(M) = 0$.

Suppose that $\ell\ell^\alpha(M) \geq 1$. We may assume that $q_\beta(M) \neq 0$ (otherwise the proof is done). We assert the following:

(i) $\ell\ell^\alpha(q_\beta(M)) \leq \ell\ell^\alpha(M)$;

(ii) $\ell\ell^\alpha(q_\beta(M)/\mathrm{soc}(q_\beta(M))) = \ell\ell^\alpha(q_\beta(M)) - 1$;

(iii) $\ell\ell_{q_\beta}(q_\beta(M)/\mathrm{soc}(q_\beta(M))) \leq \ell\ell^\alpha(q_\beta(M)/\mathrm{soc}(q_\beta(M)))$.

Indeed, (i) follows from the canonical epimorphism $M \to q_\beta(M)$ and 1.4. On the other hand, we already have that $q_\beta(M) \neq 0$; moreover, 2.2 implies $\mathrm{soc}(q_\beta(M)) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$, then (ii) follows from 2.1. To prove (iii), we use (i) and (ii) as follows:

$$\ell\ell^\alpha(q_\beta(M)/\mathrm{soc}(q_\beta(M))) = \ell\ell^\alpha(q_\beta(M)) - 1 \leq \ell\ell^\alpha(M) - 1 < \ell\ell^\alpha(M);$$

thus (iii) follows from our induction hypothesis.

Now, since ${q_\beta}^2 = q_\beta/(\beta \circ q_\beta)$ and β is a radical, we have that ${q_\beta}^2 = q_\beta$ and $q_\beta(M) \in \mathcal{T}_{q_\beta} = \mathcal{F}_\beta$. Therefore it follows from the definition of $\ell\ell_{q_\beta}$ that $\ell\ell_{q_\beta}(M) = \ell\ell_{q_\beta}(q_\beta(M))$ and so from 1.3 (c), we get
$\ell\ell_{q_\beta}(q_\beta(M)) = \ell\ell_{q_\beta}(q_\beta(M)/\mathrm{soc}(q_\beta(M))) + 1 \leq \ell\ell^\alpha(q_\beta(M)/\mathrm{soc}(q_\beta(M))) + 1 = \ell\ell^\alpha(q_\beta(M)) \leq \ell\ell^\alpha(M)$. □

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\alpha \in \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathcal{C})$ be a pre-radical such that q_α preserves monomorphisms. If $0 \neq M \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathrm{top}(M) \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$, then $M \notin \mathcal{T}_\alpha$ and $\ell\ell_{q_\alpha}(M) = \ell\ell_{q_\alpha}(\mathrm{rad}(M)) + 1$.*

Proof. Let $0 \neq M \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfying that $\mathrm{top}(M) \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$. Suppose that $M \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$, then $\mathrm{top}(M) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$ and hence $\mathrm{top}(M) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{F}_\alpha = \{0\}$, a contradiction. Hence $M \notin \mathcal{T}_\alpha$. We assert that for any $i \geq 0$ there is a natural map $\pi_i : 1_{\mathcal{C}} \to q_\alpha \circ G^i_{q_\alpha}$such that for each $X \in \mathcal{C}$, the map $\pi_{i,X} : X \to q_\alpha \circ G^i_{q_\alpha}(X)$ is an epimorphism. Indeed, for each $Z \in \mathcal{C}$ consider the following canonical quotients maps $p_Z : Z \to q_\alpha(Z)$ and $\sigma_Z : q_\alpha(Z) \to G_{q_\alpha}(Z)$. For each $X \in \mathcal{C}$, we set $\pi_{0,X} := p_X$ and we inductively define $\pi_{i,X} := p_{G^i_{q_\alpha}(X)}\, \sigma_{G^{i-1}_{q_\alpha}(X)}\, \pi_{i-1,X}$ for $i \geq 1$. It can be seen that the maps defined above satisfy the required conditions.

Take $m := \ell\ell_{q_\alpha}(M)$. Observe that $m > 0$ since $M \notin \mathcal{T}_\alpha = \mathcal{F}_{q_\alpha}$. We assert that $N := q_\alpha \circ G^{m-1}_{q_\alpha}(M)$ is semisimple. Indeed,

$$0 = q_\alpha \circ G^{m}_{q_\alpha}(M) = q_\alpha \circ G_{q_\alpha}(G^{m-1}_{q_\alpha}(M)) = q_\alpha(N/\mathrm{soc}(N))$$

and hence $N/\mathrm{soc}(N) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$ proving that $\mathrm{top}(N/\mathrm{soc}(N)) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$. On the other hand, the canonical epimorphisms $M \to N$ and $N \to N/\mathrm{soc}(N)$ induce an epimorphism $\mathrm{top}(M) \to \mathrm{top}(N/\mathrm{soc}(N))$ which is splitting, giving us a monomorphism $\mathrm{top}(N/\mathrm{soc}(N)) \to \mathrm{top}(M)$. Hence $\mathrm{top}(N/\mathrm{soc}(N)) \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ since $\mathrm{top}(M) \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$, and therefore, $\mathrm{top}(N/\mathrm{soc}(N)) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{F}_\alpha = \{0\}$. Then $N = \mathrm{soc}(N)$ which means that N is semisimple. In what follows, we use the fact that the additive functor $q_\alpha \circ G^{i}_{q_\alpha}$ preserves monomorphisms for any $i \geq 0$. Consider the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{rad}(M) \arrow[r, "i_M"] \arrow[d, "\pi_{m-1,\mathrm{rad}(M)}"'] & M \arrow[d, "\pi_{m-1,M}"] \\
q_\alpha \circ G^{m-1}_{q_\alpha}(\mathrm{rad}(M)) \arrow[r, "j"'] & q_\alpha \circ G^{m-1}_{q_\alpha}(M) = N
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $j := q_\alpha \circ G^{m-1}_{q_\alpha}(i_M)$ is a monomorphism since the inclusion i_M is so. Then $\pi_{m-1,M}\, i_M(\mathrm{rad}(M)) \subseteq \mathrm{rad}(N) = 0$ and hence $j\,\pi_{m-1,\mathrm{rad}(M)} = 0$. Using that j is a monomorphism, we have $\pi_{m-1,\mathrm{rad}(M)} = 0$ and thus $q_\alpha\, G^{m-1}_{q_\alpha}(\mathrm{rad}(M)) = 0$; proving that $\ell := \ell\ell_{q_\alpha}(\mathrm{rad}(M)) \leq m-1$. We assert that $\ell = m-1$.
Suppose that $\ell < m-1$. In this case, we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{rad}(M) \arrow[r, "i_M"] \arrow[d, "\pi_{\ell,\mathrm{rad}(M)}"'] & M \arrow[d, "\pi_{\ell,M}"] \\
0 \arrow[r] & q_\alpha \circ G^{\ell}_{q_\alpha}(M).
\end{tikzcd}$$

So, there is an epimorphism $\theta : \mathrm{top}(M) \to q_\alpha \circ \mathrm{G}^{\ell}_{\alpha}(M)$ such that $\theta\, p = \pi_{\ell,M}$, where $p : M \to \mathrm{top}(M)$ is the canonical epimorphism. Therefore $q_\alpha \circ \mathrm{G}^{\ell}_{\alpha}(M)$ is semisimple and hence $\ell\ell_{q_\alpha}(M) \leq \ell + 1 < m$ a contradiction; proving that $\ell = m-1$. □

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathcal{C})$ be pre-radicals. If $\alpha^2 = \alpha$ and $\mathcal{T}_\beta \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ then* $\mathrm{top}(\mathrm{Im}(\alpha)) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\beta \cap \mathcal{T}_\alpha$.

Proof. Since $\alpha^2 = \alpha$, we have $\mathrm{Im}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\alpha$ and so, by 1.6 (c), $\mathrm{top}(\mathrm{Im}(\alpha)) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\alpha$. Let S be a simple Λ-module in $\mathrm{top}(\alpha(M))$ for $M \in \mathcal{C}$. In particular $S \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$. Since $\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(S,-)|_{\mathcal{F}_\alpha} = 0$ (otherwise we would have that $S \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{T}_\alpha = \{0\}$), it follows from $\mathcal{T}_\beta \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ that $\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(S,-)|_{\mathcal{T}_\beta} = 0$ and hence $S \notin \mathcal{T}_\beta$. Consider the exact sequence $0 \to \beta(S) \to S \to q_\beta(S) \to 0$. If $\beta(S) \neq 0$ then $\beta(S) = S$ and this implies that $S \in \mathcal{T}_\beta$, a contradiction, proving that $\beta(S) = 0$. Hence $S \in \mathcal{F}_\beta$ for any simple S in $\mathrm{top}(\alpha(M))$, and so, $\mathrm{top}(\alpha(M)) \in \mathcal{F}_\beta$ for any $M \in \mathcal{C}$. □

We are now ready to prove the second comparison theorem.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathcal{C})$ be pre-radicals such that $\alpha^2 = \alpha$ and q_β preserves monomorphisms. Then*

$$\ell\ell^{\alpha}(M) \leq \ell\ell_{q_\beta}(M) \textit{ for each } M \in \mathcal{C} \textit{ if and only if } \mathcal{T}_\beta \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\alpha.$$

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) Let $M \in \mathcal{T}_\beta = \mathcal{F}_{q_\beta}$. By 1.3 we have $\ell\ell_{q_\beta}(M) = 0$, and so, $\ell\ell^{\alpha}(M) = 0$; giving us that $M \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$.

($\Leftarrow$) $\mathcal{T}_\beta \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\alpha$. The proof will be carried out by induction on $\ell\ell_{q_\beta}(M)$ for $M \in \mathcal{C}$. If $\ell\ell_{q_\beta}(M) = 0$ then $M \in \mathcal{F}_{q_\beta} = \mathcal{T}_\beta \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ and hence $\ell\ell^{\alpha}(M) = 0$ by 1.3.
Suppose that $\ell\ell_{q_\beta}(M) \geq 1$. We may assume that $\alpha(M) \neq 0$ (otherwise there is nothing to prove). We assert the following:

(i) $\ell\ell_{q_\beta}(\alpha(M)) \leq \ell\ell_{q_\beta}(M)$;

(ii) $\ell\ell_{q_\beta}(\mathrm{rad}(\alpha(M)) = \ell\ell_{q_\beta}(\alpha(M)) - 1$;

(iii) $\ell\ell^{\alpha}(\mathrm{rad}(\alpha(M))) \leq \ell\ell_{q_\beta}(\mathrm{rad}(\alpha(M)))$;

(iv) $\ell\ell^{\alpha}(\mathrm{rad}(\alpha(M))) + 1 \leq \ell\ell_{q_\beta}(M)$.

Indeed, (i) follows from the monomorphism $\alpha(M) \to M$ and the fact that q_β preserves monomorphisms (see in 1.4 (c)). To prove (ii), we have by 2.5 that $\mathrm{top}(\alpha(M)) \in \mathcal{F}_\beta$. The result then follows from 2.4. On the other hand, we use (i), (ii) and induction to get (iii) as follows: $\ell\ell_{q_\beta}(\mathrm{rad}(\alpha(M))) \leq \ell\ell_{q_\beta}(M) - 1 < \ell\ell_{q_\beta}(M)$. Finally, the preceding inequalities and (iii) give us (iv).

To finish the proof, we use (iv) and $\alpha^2 = \alpha$, as follows:

$$\ell\ell^{\alpha}(M) = \ell\ell^{\alpha}(\alpha(M)) = \ell\ell^{\alpha}(\mathrm{rad}(\alpha(M))) + 1 \leq \ell\ell_{q_\beta}(M).$$

□

3. LAYER LENGTHS INDUCED BY TORSION RADICALS

In order to state and prove our third comparison theorem, we recall some notions and basic results about torsion theories for $\mathcal{C}$ (see, for example, in [1] and [4]). In particular, the torsion radical attached to a torsion theory for $\mathcal{C}$ will be of crucial importance. Recall also that for a given class $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathcal{C}$ and a Λ-module M, the trace of $\mathcal{X}$ in M is the Λ-submodule $\mathrm{Trace}_{\mathcal{X}}(M)$ of M generated by the images $\mathrm{Im}(f)$ of the maps $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(X, M)$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$.

Definition 3.1. *A* **torsion theory** *for $\mathcal{C}$ is a pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ of classes of modules in $\mathcal{C}$ satisfying the following conditions:*

(a) $\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(M, N) = 0$ *for any $M \in \mathcal{T}$ and $N \in \mathcal{F}$;*

(b) *for any $X \in \mathcal{C}$, if $\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(X, -)|_{\mathcal{F}} = 0$ then $X \in \mathcal{T}$;*

(c) *for any $X \in \mathcal{C}$, if $\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(-, X)|_{\mathcal{T}} = 0$ then $X \in \mathcal{F}$.*

Remark 3.2. *Let $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ be a torsion theory for $\mathcal{C}$. We recall that $t := \mathrm{Trace}_{\mathcal{T}}$ is the so called* **torsion radical** *attached to $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$. It can be seen that $t(M)$ is the largest submodule of M lying in $\mathcal{T}$.*

The connection between torsion theories for $\mathcal{C}$ and subfunctors of $1_{\mathcal{C}}$ is given by the following well known result.

Proposition 3.3. [1, 4] *The map $\phi(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F}) := \mathrm{Trace}_{\mathcal{T}}$ induces a bijection*

$$\{\text{ torsion theories for } \mathcal{C}\} \xrightarrow{\phi} \{\text{ idempotent radicals in } \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathcal{C})\}$$

with inverse $\phi^{-1}(\alpha) = (\mathcal{T}_\alpha, \mathcal{F}_\alpha)$.

Now, we are ready to state and prove the third comparison theorem.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $(\mathcal{T},\mathcal{F})$ and $(\mathcal{T}',\mathcal{F}')$ be torsion theories for $\mathcal{C}$; and consider the torsion radicals $t := \mathrm{Trace}_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $t' := \mathrm{Trace}_{\mathcal{T}'}$. Then*

$$\ell\ell^{t}(M) = \ell\ell_{q_{t'}}(M) \text{ for each } M \in \mathcal{C} \text{ if and only if } \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{T}'.$$

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) Let $\ell\ell^{t}(M) = \ell\ell_{q_{t'}}(M)$ for each $M \in \mathcal{C}$. Then, by 1.3 (a) and 3.3, we have the equivalences: $M \in \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_t \Leftrightarrow \ell\ell^{t}(M) = 0 = \ell\ell_{q_{t'}}(M) \Leftrightarrow M \in \mathcal{F}_{q_{t'}} = \mathcal{T}'$.

($\Leftarrow$) Let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{T}'$. To prove the result, it is enough to check the hyphotesis needed in 2.3 and 2.6 for $\alpha = t$ and $\beta = t'$. That is, we assert the following:

- (i) t and t' are idempotent radicals;
- (ii) t preserves epimorphisms;
- (iii) $q_{t'}$ preserves monomorphisms.

Indeed, (i) follows from 3.3. To prove (ii), we have firstly that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{T}'$ implies $\mathcal{F}$ is closed under quotients, and since t is radical, using [4, Ch. VI, Ex. 5], we get the result. Finally, we get (iii) from 1.7 since $\mathcal{T}' = \mathcal{F}_t$ is closed under submodules (see 1.6 (b)) and $t'^2 = t'$. □

An interpretation of 3.4 in terms of ttf-classes can be given. So, we get a new view of ttf-classes by using layer lengths. In what follows, we recall the notion of ttf-class.

Definition 3.5. [6] *A class $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathcal{C}$ is called a* **ttf-class** *if there exists classes $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ such that $(\mathcal{T},\mathcal{X})$ and $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{F})$ are torsion theories for $\mathcal{C}$. In this case, the triple $(\mathcal{T},\mathcal{X},\mathcal{F})$ is called a* **ttf-theory**.

Using the notion of ttf-triple, we can get from 3.4 the following result.

Corollary 3.6. *Given a ttf-theory $(\mathcal{T},\mathcal{X},\mathcal{F})$ for $\mathcal{C}$, we have that*

$$\ell\ell^{t}(M) = \ell\ell_{q_x}(M) \text{ for each } M \in \mathcal{C}$$

where $t := \mathrm{Trace}_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $x := \mathrm{Trace}_{\mathcal{X}}$ are the corresponding torsion radicals.

Proof. This follows easily from 3.4. □

Given a class $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{C}$, we denote by $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{A})$ the class of the $\mathcal{A}$-filtered modules in $\mathcal{C}$. That is, $M \in \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{A})$ if there is a finite chain $0 = M_0 \subseteq M_1 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq M_m = M$ of submodules of M such that each quotient M_i/M_{i-1} is isomorphic to some object in $\mathcal{A}$. We have the following easy characterization of ttf-classes for $\mathcal{C}$.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class in $\mathcal{C}$. Then, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) *$\mathcal{X}$ is a ttf-class for $\mathcal{C}$;*
- (b) *$\mathcal{X}$ is closed under extensions, submodules and quotients;*
- (c) *$\mathcal{X} = \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{S})$ for some $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{\ \Lambda\text{-simple modules}\ \}$.*

Proof. The equivalence of (b) and (c) is easy to see. On the other hand, The equivalence of (a) and (b) is well known (see for example in [1] and [4]). □

Examples 3.8. (1) *Consider the trivial ttf-theory $(\mathcal{C},0,\mathcal{C})$.In this case, the torsion radicals are $t = \mathrm{Trace}_{\mathcal{C}} = 1_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $x = \mathrm{Trace}_0 = 0$. So, $q_x = 1_{\mathcal{C}}$ and then $\ell\ell^{t}$ is the* *radical layer length and* $\ell\ell_{q_x}$ *is the socle layer length. In this case, 3.6 gives us the well known equality for the Loewy Length.*

(2) *Consider the functors* $K, S \in \operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathcal{C})$*, which were introduced in* [3]*. These functors were defined throughout the exact sequences:* $0 \to K(M) \to M \to Q(M) \to 0$ *and* $0 \to S(M) \to M \to C(M) \to 0$ *where* $K(M)$ *(resp.* $C(M)$*) is the maximal submodule (resp. quotient) of* M *lying in* $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{S}^{<\infty})$ *with* $\mathcal{S}^{<\infty}$ *the class of the simple* Λ*-modules of finite projective dimension. So, we have that* K *and* S *are idempotent radicals, and moreover,* $q_K = Q$ *and* $q_S = C$*. Since* $\mathcal{F}_S = \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{S}^{<\infty}) = \mathcal{T}_K$*, we have that* $(\mathcal{T}_S, \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{S}^{<\infty}), \mathcal{F}_K)$ *is a ttf-theory for* $\mathcal{C}$*. Hence, by 3.6, we get that*

$$\ell\ell^{\infty}(M) := \ell\ell^{S}(M) = \ell\ell_{q_K}(M) =: \ell\ell_{\infty}(M),$$

where $\ell\ell^{\infty}$ *is the so called infinite-layer length in* [3].

In what follows we use the following notation. Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{\ \Lambda\text{-simple modules}\ \}$, $\mathcal{S}' := \{\ \Lambda\text{-simple modules}\ \} \setminus \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}} := \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{S})$. Following 3.7, we say that the ttf-theory $(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{S}})$ is generated by the class $\mathcal{S}$. We also consider the torsion radicals $t_{\mathcal{S}} := \operatorname{Trace}_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}}$ and $x_{\mathcal{S}} := \operatorname{Trace}_{\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}}}$.

Proposition 3.9. *Let* $(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{S}})$ *be the ttf-theory generated by the class* $\mathcal{S}$*. Then, the following statements hold true.*

(a) $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}} = \{M \in \mathcal{C}\ :\ \operatorname{top}(M) \in \operatorname{add}(\mathcal{S}')\}$.

(b) $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{S}} = \{M \in \mathcal{C}\ :\ \operatorname{soc}(M) \in \operatorname{add}(\mathcal{S}')\}$.

(c) *The torsion class* $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}$ *is closed under projective covers of objects in* $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}$.

(d) *The set* $I_{\mathcal{S}} := t_{\mathcal{S}}({}_{\Lambda}\Lambda)$ *is an ideal of* Λ *and* $t_{\mathcal{S}}(M) = I_{\mathcal{S}}M$ *for any* $M \in \mathcal{C}$.

Proof. (a) Let $M \in \mathcal{C}$ be such that $\operatorname{top}(M) \in \operatorname{add}(\mathcal{S}')$. We prove that $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Lambda}(M, -)|_{\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}}}$ is zero. Suppose that there is some non zero morphism $f : M \to X$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}}$. We may assume that f is surjective, thus $\operatorname{top}(X)$ is a direct summand of $\operatorname{top}(M)$ contradicting that $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{S}' = \emptyset$; proving that $M \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}}$.

Let $M \in \mathcal{C}$ be such that $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Lambda}(M, -)|_{\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}}}$ is zero. If there were some $S \in \mathcal{S}$ being a direct summand of $\operatorname{top}(M)$, then by composing the canonical projections $M \to \operatorname{top}(M) \to S$, we would obtain that $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Lambda}(M, S) \neq 0$. Hence $\operatorname{top}(M) \in \operatorname{add}(\mathcal{S}')$.

(b) It is quite similar to the proof of (a).

(c) It follows from (a) since $\operatorname{top}(P_0(M)) \simeq \operatorname{top}(M)$, where $P_0(M)$ is the projective cover of M.

(d) It follows by 3.7 and [4, Ch. VI, Ex. 5]. □

Proposition 3.10. *Let* $\mathcal{S}_1$ *and* $\mathcal{S}_2$ *be subsets of the set* $\{\ \Lambda$*-simple modules* $\}$*. Then*

$$\mathcal{S}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_2 \quad \textit{if and only if} \quad \ell\ell^{t_{\mathcal{S}_2}}(M) \leq \ell\ell^{t_{\mathcal{S}_1}}(M) \quad \forall M \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Proof. It is clear that $\mathcal{S}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_2$ is equivalent to the inclusion $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}_1} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}_2}$. On the other hand, we have that $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}_1} = \mathcal{F}_{t_{\mathcal{S}_1}}$ and $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}_2} = \mathcal{T}_{x_{\mathcal{S}_2}}$ (see 3.3). Hence, by 2.3, it follows that $\mathcal{S}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_2$ iff $\ell\ell_{q_{x_{\mathcal{S}_2}}}(M) \leq \ell\ell^{t_{\mathcal{S}_1}}(M) \quad \forall M \in \mathcal{C}$. Finally, from 3.6, we know that $\ell\ell_{q_{x_{\mathcal{S}_2}}}(M) = \ell\ell^{t_{\mathcal{S}_2}}(M) \quad \forall M \in \mathcal{C}$; proving the result. □

4. Applications to the finitistic dimension

Definition 4.1. *Let* $\mathcal{X}$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}$ *be classes of* $\mathcal{C}$ *and* $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{\ \Lambda$*-simple modules* $\}$. *We introduce the following classes of* Λ*-modules:*

- $\mathcal{X} \oplus \mathcal{Y} := \{X \oplus Y \ : \ X \in \mathcal{X},\, Y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$,
- $\mathcal{C}_\ell^{\mathcal{S}} := \{M \in \mathcal{C} \ : \ \ell\ell^{t_{\mathcal{S}}}\,(M) \leq \ell\}$,
- $\mathbb{T}_\ell^{\mathcal{S}} := \mathcal{C}_\ell^{\mathcal{S}} \oplus \Omega\,(\mathcal{C}_\ell^{\mathcal{S}})$, *where* $\Omega(M)$ *denotes the first syzygy of* $M \in \operatorname{mod}(\Lambda)$ *and* $\Omega(\mathcal{X}) = \{\Omega(M) : M \in \mathcal{X}\}$,
- *the class* $\mathcal{S}^{<\infty}$ *of the simple* Λ*-modules of finite projective dimension.*

Remark 4.2. *Let* $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{\ \Lambda$*-simple modules* $\}$, $J := \operatorname{rad}(\Lambda)$ *and* $I_{\mathcal{S}} := t_{\mathcal{S}}\,({}_\Lambda\Lambda)$. *Consider the quotient ring* $\Gamma := \Lambda/J_\ell(\mathcal{S})$ *where* $J_\ell(\mathcal{S}) := I_{\mathcal{S}}(JI_{\mathcal{S}})^\ell \trianglelefteq \Lambda$. *So, by 3.9 (d), it is not hard to see that*

$$\mathcal{C}_\ell^{\mathcal{S}} = \{M \in \mathcal{C} \ : \ J_\ell(\mathcal{S})M = 0\} \simeq \operatorname{mod}(\Gamma).$$

Lemma 4.3. *Let* $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{\ \Lambda$*-simple modules* $\}$ *and* $M \in \mathcal{C}$. *If* $t_{\mathcal{S}}\,(M) \neq 0$ *then*

$$\ell\ell^{t_{\mathcal{S}}}\,(\Omega\, t_{\mathcal{S}}(M)) \leq \ell\ell^{t_{\mathcal{S}}}\,({}_\Lambda\Lambda) - 1.$$

Proof. Assume that $t_{\mathcal{S}}\,(M) \neq 0$. Consider the following exact sequence $0 \to \Omega\, t_{\mathcal{S}}(M) \to P \to t_{\mathcal{S}}(M) \to 0$ where P is the projective cover of $t_{\mathcal{S}}(M)$. Hence, by 3.9, it follows that $0 \neq P \in \mathcal{T}_{t_{\mathcal{S}}}$. So, by using 1.3 and 1.4, we get

$$\ell\ell^{t_{\mathcal{S}}}\,(\Omega\, t_{\mathcal{S}}(M)) \leq \ell\ell^{t_{\mathcal{S}}}\,(\operatorname{rad}(P)) = \ell\ell^{t_{\mathcal{S}}}\,(P) - 1 \leq \ell\ell^{t_{\mathcal{S}}}\,({}_\Lambda\Lambda) - 1.$$

□

In what follows, we use the function $\Psi : \operatorname{mod}(\Lambda) \to \mathbb{N}$ defined by Igusa and Todorov in [5]. We refer to [5, 2] for the definition and main properties of this function. Given $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \operatorname{mod}(\Lambda)$, we set $\Psi\mathrm{dim}\,(\mathcal{X}) = \sup\{\Psi(M) : M \in \mathcal{X}\}$.

Theorem 4.4. *Let* $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}^{<\infty}$. *If* $\ell\ell^{t_{\mathcal{S}}}\,({}_\Lambda\Lambda) \leq 2\ell + 1$ *and* $\Psi\mathrm{dim}\,(\mathbb{T}_\ell^{\mathcal{S}})$ *is finite, then*

$$\text{fin.dim.}\,(\Lambda) \leq \max\{\operatorname{pd}(\mathcal{S}),\, 2 + \Psi\mathrm{dim}\,(\mathbb{T}_\ell^{\mathcal{S}})\} < \infty.$$

Proof. Let $\beta := \operatorname{pd}(\mathcal{S})$ and $M \in \mathcal{C}$ of finite projective dimension. Assume that $\ell\ell^{t_{\mathcal{S}}}\,({}_\Lambda\Lambda) \leq 2\ell + 1$ and $\Psi\mathrm{dim}\,(\mathbb{T}_\ell^{\mathcal{S}}) < \infty$. Consider the canonical exact sequence $0 \to t_{\mathcal{S}}\,(M) \to M \to q_{t_{\mathcal{S}}}\,(M) \to 0$. Since $q_{t_{\mathcal{S}}}\,(M) \in \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\operatorname{pd}(M) < \infty$, it follows that $\operatorname{pd}(t_{\mathcal{S}}\,(M)) < \infty$ and also that

$$\operatorname{pd}(M) \leq \max\{\beta, \operatorname{pd}(t_{\mathcal{S}}\,(M))\} \leq \max\{\beta, 1 + \operatorname{pd}(\Omega\, t_{\mathcal{S}}\,(M))\}.$$

If $t_{\mathcal{S}}\,(M) = 0$ then $M \in \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}}$, and so $\operatorname{pd}(M) \leq \beta$ getting the result in this case. So, we can assume that $t_{\mathcal{S}}\,(M) \neq 0$, and hence by 4.3 $\ell\ell^{t_{\mathcal{S}}}\,(\Omega\, t_{\mathcal{S}}\,(M)) \leq 2\ell$. Therefore $N := F^\ell_{t_{\mathcal{S}}}(\Omega\, t_{\mathcal{S}}\,(M)) \in \mathcal{C}_\ell^{\mathcal{S}}$. Recall, as can be seen in 4.2, that $N = J_\ell(\ mathcalS)\Omega\, t_{\mathcal{S}}\,(M)$, and then we have the exact sequence $0 \to N \to \Omega\, t_{\mathcal{S}}\,(M) \to N' \to 0$ where $N' := \Omega\, t_{\mathcal{S}}\,(M)/N \in \mathcal{C}_\ell^{\mathcal{S}}$. Using [5, Remark 5], we get

$$\operatorname{pd}(\Omega\, t_{\mathcal{S}}\,(M)) \leq 1 + \Psi(N \oplus \Omega(N')) \leq 1 + \Psi\mathrm{dim}\,(\mathbb{T}_\ell^{\mathcal{S}});$$

proving the result. □

Remark 4.5. *By taking* $\mathcal{S}=\emptyset$ *in 4.4, we obtain as a consequence the main result in* [7] *(see Theorem 3) : If* $J^{2\ell+1}=0$ *and* $\Gamma:=\Lambda/J^{\ell}$ *is of finite representation type, then* $\operatorname{fin.dim.}(\Lambda)$ *is finite. Indeed, since* $\mathcal{S}$ *is empty, we have that* $t_{\mathcal{S}}=1_{\mathcal{C}}$*, and so by 4.2* $\mathcal{C}_{\ell}^{\mathcal{S}}\simeq \operatorname{mod}(\Gamma)$*. Therefore the test class* $\mathbb{T}_{\ell}^{\mathcal{S}}$ *is of finite representation type, giving us that* $\operatorname{fin.dim.}(\Lambda)\leq 2+\Psi\dim(\mathbb{T}_{\ell}^{\mathcal{S}})<\infty$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let* $\mathcal{S}\subseteq\mathcal{S}^{<\infty}$, $\beta:=\operatorname{pd}(\mathcal{S})$ *and* $\Sigma':=\bigoplus_{X\in\mathcal{S}'}X$*. Then the following statements hold true.*

(a) *For any* $M\in\mathcal{C}_1^{\mathcal{S}}$*, we have that* $\Omega^{\beta+1}(M)\oplus P\simeq\Omega^{\beta+1}(M_{\mathcal{S}'})\oplus P'$ *where* P *and* P' *are projective* Λ*-modules and* $M_{\mathcal{S}'}\in\operatorname{add}(\mathcal{S}')$.

(b) $\Psi\dim(\mathbb{T}_1^{\mathcal{S}})\leq 1+\beta+\Psi(\Omega^{\beta+1}(\Sigma')\oplus\Omega^{\beta+2}(\Sigma'))<\infty$.

Proof. (a) Let $M\in\mathcal{C}_1^{\mathcal{S}}$. So $t_{\mathcal{S}}F_{t_{\mathcal{S}}}(M)=0$ and then $\operatorname{rad}\circ t_{\mathcal{S}}(M)=F_{t_{\mathcal{S}}}(M)\in\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}}$. Moreover $q_{t_{\mathcal{S}}}(M)\in\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{S}}$, hence $\operatorname{pd}(F_{t_{\mathcal{S}}}(M))\leq\beta$ and $\operatorname{pd}(q_{t_{\mathcal{S}}}(M))\leq\beta$. Therefore, applying [2, Lemma 3.6] to the exact sequences $0\to t_{\mathcal{S}}(M)\to M\to q_{t_{\mathcal{S}}}(M)\to 0$ and $0\to F_{t_{\mathcal{S}}}(M)\to t_{\mathcal{S}}(M)\to\operatorname{top}(t_{\mathcal{S}}(M))\to 0$ the result follows since $M_{\mathcal{S}'}:=\operatorname{top}(t_{\mathcal{S}}(M))\in\operatorname{add}(\mathcal{S}')$ by 3.9 (a).

(b) Let $M=X\oplus\Omega(Y)$ with $X,Y\in\mathcal{C}_1^{\mathcal{S}}$. Hence, by (a), we have that $\Omega^{\beta+1}(M)\simeq\Omega^{\beta+1}(X_{\mathcal{S}'})\oplus\Omega^{\beta+2}(Y_{\mathcal{S}'})\oplus P$ for some projective Λ-module P and $X_{\mathcal{S}'},Y_{\mathcal{S}'}\in\operatorname{add}(\mathcal{S}')$. Applying [2, Proposition 3.5] $1+\beta$ times to M and then, by the preceding isomorphism, we get $\Psi(M)\leq 1+\beta+\Psi(\Omega^{\beta+1}(M))\leq 1+\beta+\Psi(\Omega^{\beta+1}(\Sigma')\oplus\Omega^{\beta+2}(\Sigma'))<\infty$. □

Corollary 4.7. *Let* $\mathcal{S}\subseteq\mathcal{S}^{<\infty}$, $\beta:=\operatorname{pd}(\mathcal{S})$ *and* $\Sigma':=\bigoplus_{X\in\mathcal{S}'}X$*. If* $\ell\ell^{t_{\mathcal{S}}}({}_{\Lambda}\Lambda)\leq 3$ *then* $\operatorname{fin.dim.}(\Lambda)\leq 3+\beta+\Psi(\Omega^{\beta+1}(\Sigma')\oplus\Omega^{\beta+2}(\Sigma'))<\infty$.

Proof. It follows from 4.4 and 4.6. □

Remark 4.8. *About Corollary 4.7.*

1 *By taking* $\mathcal{S}=\mathcal{S}^{<\infty}$*, we get the main result in* [3] *(see Theorem 5.5). On the other hand, by 3.10, we see that the "strongest" version that can be obtained from 4.7 is precisely when* $\mathcal{S}=\mathcal{S}^{<\infty}$.

2 *If* $\mathcal{S}$ *is empty we get the well know result of "radical cube equal to zero". That is, if* $J^3=0$ *then* $\operatorname{fin.dim.}(\Lambda)\leq 3+\Psi(\Omega(\Lambda/J)\oplus\Omega^2(\Lambda/J))<\infty$ *where* $J:=\operatorname{rad}(\Lambda)$.

References

[1] I. Assem, D. Simson, A. Skowronski. Elements of the Representation Theory of Associative Algebras: 1. *London Mathematical Society Student Texts 65.* Cambridge University Press 2006.

[2] F. Huard, M. Lanzilotta, O. Mendoza. An approach to the Finitistic Dimension Conjecture. *J. of Algebra* 319, 3918-3934, (2008).

[3] F. Huard, M. Lanzilotta, O. Mendoza. Finitistic Dimension Through Infinite Projective Dimension. *Bull. London Math. Soc.* 41, 367-376, (2009).

[4] Bo Stenstrom. Rings of Quotients. *Springer-Verlag New York Heidelberg Berlin.* (1975).

[5] K. Igusa, G. Todorov. On the finitistic global dimension conjecture for artin algebras. *Representation of algebras and related topics,* 201-204. Field Inst. Commun., 45. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005.

[6] J.P. Jans. Some aspects of torsion. *Pacifc Journal of Math.* Vol. 15, No. 4 (1965).

[7] Y. Wang. A note on the finitistic dimension conjecture. *Comm. in algebra* 22(7),419-449 (1994).

[8] B. Zimmerman-Huisgen. The finitistic dimension conjecture- a tale of 3.5 decades. in: Abelian groups and modules (Padova, 1994) 501-517. Math. Appl. 343, Kluwer Acad. Publ. Dordrecht, 1995.

François Huard:
Department of mathematics, Bishop's University,
Sherbrooke, Québec, CANADA, J1M1Z7.
`fhuard@ubishops.ca`

Marcelo Lanzilotta:
Instituto de Matemática y Estadística Rafael Laguardia,
J. Herrera y Reissig 565, Facultad de Ingeniería, Universidad de la República. CP 11300, Montevideo, URUGUAY.
`marclan@fing.edu.uy`

Octavio Mendoza Hernández:
Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
Circuito Exterior, Ciudad Universitaria, C.P. 04510, México, D.F. MÉXICO.
`omendoza@matem.unam.mx`